UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,647	09/29/2004	Gueorgui Momtchilov	2006579-0314	5646

69665 7590 03/11/2008
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER	
FAN, HUA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4134	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,647	MOMTCHILOV ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUA FAN	4134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-76* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-76* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *9/29/04* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/18/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: For example: The recitation of" detecting a break in the presentation level connection" in claims 21-22, 54-55 lacks antecedent basis in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 10-12, 15, 23, 34, 36, 43-45, 48, 56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al.

As to claim 1, Arteaga et al. discloses a method for handling events occurring at a client ([0042]), said method comprising the steps of: (a) providing a client communicating with a server over a network (figure 1); (b) detecting an event notification regarding a device in communication with the client ([0042]); (c) redirecting said event notification to the server from the client ([0042]), and (d) receiving, from the server, a command directed to said device

([0042]-[0043]). Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the events are plug-and-play events. Soin et al. discloses detecting plug-and-play events ([0112]-[0113]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding detecting plug-and-play events. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to discover devices (Soin et al., [0029]).

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol. Soin et al. discloses the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol ("RDP" [0092]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding using presentation-level protocol for communication between client and server. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to support different types of network topologies and multiple LAN protocols (Soin et al., [0073]).

As to claim 3, Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) uses a virtual channel to redirect said event notification. Soin et al. disclose using virtual channel to redirect events ([0074]; [0079]-[0081])

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding using virtual channel to redirect events. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to support different types of network topologies and multiple LAN protocols (Soin et al., [0073]).

As to claim 10, Soin et al discloses the device in communication with the client uses one of the USB (Universal Serial Bus) protocol, IEEE 1394 protocol, Bluetooth protocol, wi-fi protocol, wireless protocol, and infrared (IR) protocol to communicate with the client (wireless protocol, [0003]; [0008]; [0021]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding using wireless protocol for communication between the device and the client. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to allow easy access for mobile users, provide an easy connection where a wired solution is not practical (Soin et al., [0101]).

As to claim 11, Arteaga et al. discloses a method for handling events occurring at a client in communication with a server ([0042]; figure 1), said method comprising the steps of: a) receiving from said client an event notification regarding a device in communication with the client ([0042]); b) notifying an application program hosted by the server of the occurrence of the event notification ([0042]); c) receiving from the application program hosted by the server a command directed to the device ([0042]-[0043]); and d) transmitting to the client a command directed to the device ([0043]). Soin et al. discloses detecting plug-and-play events ([0112]-[0113]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding detecting plug-and-play events. See similar motivation in claim 1 rejection.

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol. Soin et al. discloses the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol ("RDP" [0092]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding using presentation-level protocol for communication between client and server. See similar motivation in claim 1 rejection.

As to claim 12, see similar rejection to claim 3.

As to claim 15, Arteaga et al. discloses the method of claim 11 wherein step (b) further comprises the step of: transmitting the event notification to applications communicating with the server within the session ([0042]).

As to claim 23, Arteaga et al. discloses a method for handling events occurring at a client in communication with a server ([0042]), said method comprising the steps of: a) receiving from said client an event notification regarding a device in communication with the client ([0042); b) notifying an application program hosted by the server of the occurrence of the event notification ([0042]); c) receiving from the application program hosted by the server a command directed to the device ([0042]-[0043]); and d) transmitting to the client a command directed to the device ([0043]). Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol. Soin et al. discloses the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol ("RDP" [0092]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al.

regarding using presentation-level protocol for communication between client and server. See similar motivation in claim 1 rejection.

Claims (34, 36, 43-45, 48, 56) are manufacture claims corresponding to method claims (1, 3, 10-12, 15, 23). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

4. Claims 2, 4, 13-14, 16, 35, 37, 46-47, 49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., and further in view of US patent 7171478 to Lueckhoff et al.

As to claim 2, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. discloses transmitting the event notification to the server using virtual channel (Arteaga et al., [0042]; Soin et al., [0074]). However, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose generating context identifier and binding the context identifier to the event notification. Lueckhoff et al. discloses generating context identifier (abstract; col. 7, line 41 – col. 8, line 6) and binding the context identifier to the event notification, and sending the bound event notification to server (col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 11).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding generating context identifier and binding the context identifier to the event notification, and sending the bound event notification to server. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to couple session management for the user context with that of application on server (Lueckhoff et al., col. 7, lines 55-57).

As to claim 4, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. discloses issuing a command to the identified device (Arteaga et al., ([0042]-[0043]). However, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose receiving from a server a command including a generated context identifier; identifying the device using the context identifier. Lueckhoff et al. discloses receiving from a server a command including a generated context identifier (col. 7, line 49 – col. 8, line 6) and identifying the event source using the context identifier (col. 7, line 49 – col. 8, line 6).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding generating context identifier and binding the context identifier to the event notification, and sending the bound event notification to server. See similar motivation in claim 2 rejection.

As to claim 13, see similar rejection to claim 2.

As to claim 14, Arteaga et al. discloses creating a server-unique name to identify the device connected to the client that generated the event notification ([0042]). Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose using server unique name to map the client device to a specific session on the server established by the presentation level protocol. Lueckhoff et al. discloses using server unique name to map the client event source to a specific session on the server (col. 7, line 49 – col. 8, line 6).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding server unique name to map the client event source to a specific session on the server. See similar motivation in claim 2 rejection.

As to claim 16, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not disclose the method of claim 11 wherein step (b) further comprises the step of: transmitting the event notification only to applications communicating with the server which have previously registered a callback for a type of event causing the event notification. Lueckhoff et al. discloses transmitting the event notification only to applications communicating with the server which have previously registered a callback for a type of event causing the event notification (col. 7, line 59 – col. 8, line 15; col. 9, lines 22-46).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding transmitting the event notification only to applications communicating with the server which have previously registered a callback for a type of event causing the event notification. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to invoke the appropriate application on the server (Lueckhoff et al., col. 7, lines 60-62).

Claims (35, 37, 46-47, 49) are manufacture claims corresponding to method claims (2, 4, 13-14, 15) respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

5. Claims 5, 7, 17, 19, 38, 40, 50, 52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., and further in view of US patent 6982656 to Coppinger et al.

As to claim 5, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said event notification is generated as a result of a device arrival. Coppinger et al. discloses transmitting a mobile asset arrival message to server (abstract; figure 1, 3).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Coppinger et al. regarding transmitting a mobile asset arrival message to server. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to monitor and report the status of a mobile asset (Coppinger et al., abstract, lines 1-4).

As to claim 7, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said event notification is generated as a result of a device removal. Coppinger et al. discloses transmitting a mobile asset departure message to server (abstract; figure 1, 3).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. with the method disclosed by Coppinger et al. regarding transmitting a mobile asset departure message to server. See similar motivation in claim 5 rejection.

As to claim 17, see similar rejection to claim 5.

As to claim 19, see similar rejection to claim 7.

Claims (38, 40, 50, 52) are manufacture claims corresponding to method claims (5, 7, 17, 19). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

6. Claims 6, 8, 18, 20, 39, 41, 51, 53 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., and further in view of US patent 6982656 to Coppinger et al., as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of US publication 2002/0114004 to Ferlitsch.

As to claim 6, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Coppinger et al. does not disclose the method of claim 5 wherein said command is an open command. Ferlitsch discloses server sends an open command to device ([0084]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Coppinger et al., with the method disclosed by Ferlitsch regarding server sends an open command to device. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to enable a three-way printing source/server/printing device communicating using a virtual socket concept (Ferlitsch, [0084], lines 1-3).

As to claim 8, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Coppinger et al. does not disclose the method of claim 5 wherein said command is a close command. Ferlitsch discloses server sends a close command to device ([0084]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Coppinger et al., with the method disclosed by Ferlitsch regarding server sends a close command to device. See similar motivation in claim 6 rejection.

As to claim 18, see similar rejection to claim 6.

As to claim 20, see similar rejection to claim 8.

Claims (39, 41, 51, 53) are manufacture claims corresponding to method claims (6, 8, 18, 20). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

7. Claims 9, 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., and further in view of US publication 2002/0114004 to Ferlitsch.

As to claim 9, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said event notification is associated with at least one of a GUID, vendor ID, product ID and actual device name. Ferlitsch discloses message is associated with at least one of a GUID, vendor ID, product ID and actual device name (figure 12-13).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Ferlitsch message containing device name. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to provide message source information (Ferlitsch, [0094], lines 4-6).

Claim 42 is a manufacture claim corresponding to method claim 9. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon method claim.

8. Claims 21-22, 54-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US patent 7039828 to Scott, and further in view of US publication 2002/0159419 by Morris, and further in view of US publication 2006/0075106 by Hochmuth et al.

As to claim 21, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose detecting a break in the presentation level connection. Scott discloses detecting a break in a connection with file server (col. 10, lines 31-33).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Scott regarding detecting a break in a connection with file server. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to provide support of failover (Scott, col. 10, lines 29-30).

Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al does not expressly disclose simulating a removal notification for the device connected to the client about which the event notification was received. Morris discloses emulating a USB removal ([0020]-[0021]; [0023], lines 20-25).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding emulating a USB removal. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to take advantage of USB technology, particularly the "plug and play" capability, to simplify the installation and user of Bluetooth-enabled and other wireless peripherals (Morris, [0010]).

Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose saving a collection of session data for a user session established with said presentation level connection. Hochmuch et al. discloses saving session data for a user session established with connection ([0037]; [0051]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Hochmuch et al. regarding saving user session data. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to retrieve the saved session information at a later time in order to restore the current session information (Hochmuch et al., [0052], lines 1-5).

As to claim 22, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. disclose detecting a subsequent presentation level connection from a user (Soin et al., [0093]). However, Arteaga at al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose restoring the saved collection of session data to a session established. Hochmuch et al discloses restoring the saved session data ([0052])

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Hochmuch et al. regarding restoring saved session data. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to reuse saved user profile (Hochmuch et al., [0052]).

Claims (54-55) are manufacture claims corresponding to claims (21-22). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

9. Claims 24, 26, 57, 59, 67-68, 75 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US publication 2002/0159419 by Morris.

As to claim 24, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al disclose a method for informing a server about the presence of devices connected to a client, said method comprising the steps of: (a) providing a client communicating with a server over a network using a presentation-level protocol; (b) detecting a plug-and-play event notification regarding a device in communication with the client; (c) redirecting said event notification to the server over a network; and (d) receiving, from the server, a command directed to said device. See similar rejection to claim 1 above. However, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose emulating a plug-and-play event notification. Morris discloses emulating plug-and-play event ([0020]-[0021]; [0023], lines 20-25).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding emulating a plug-and-play event notification. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to take advantage of USB technology, particularly the "plug and play" capability, to simplify the installation and use of Bluetooth-enabled and other wireless peripherals (Morris, [0010]).

As to claim 26, see similar rejection to claim 3.

Claims (57, 59) are manufacture claims corresponding to method claims (24, 26). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

As to claim 67, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al. disclose a method for detecting devices communicating with a client that have been mapped into a session on a server (Arteaga et al., [0042]; Soin et al., [0089], see similar rejection to claim 1), said method comprising the steps of: launching an application in a user session on a server intercepting device notification in the server-based user session (Arteaga et al, [0042]-[0043]); redirecting the device notification to the server (Arteaga et al., [0042]); and notifying said application hosted by the server of the occurrence of the event notification (Arteaga et al., [0042]).

Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose an enumerating device method. Morris discloses a method of detecting one or more peripheral devices ([0020]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding detecting one or more peripheral devices. See similar motivation in claim 24 rejection.

Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. does not expressly disclose emulating an arrival event for at least one device enumerated by the redirected method, said device being a device in communication with a client system that was mapped into the user session prior to said application launch. Morris discloses emulating plug-and-play events ([0020]-[0021]; [0023], lines 20-25).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding emulating a plug-and-play event notification. See similar motivation in claim 24 rejection.

As to claim 68, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al disclose a method for handling plug-and-play events occurring at a client, said method comprising the steps of: (a) detecting a plug-and-play event notification regarding a device communicating with the client; (b) redirecting said event notification to a server over a network; and (c) receiving, from the server, a command directed to said device. See similar rejection to claim 1. However, Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose USB connection between the device and the client. Morris discloses a USB connection between device and client (abstract).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding USB connection. See similar motivation in claim 24 rejection.

As to claim 75, see similar rejection to claim 3.

10. Claims 69, 71 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., as applied to claim 1

above, and further in view of US publication 2002/0159419 by Morris, as applied to claim 68 above, and further in view of US patent 6982656 to Coppinger et al.

As to claim 69, see similar rejection to claim 5.

As to claim 71, see similar rejection to claim 7.

11. Claims 70, 72 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., and further in view of US publication 2002/0159419 by Morris, and further in view of US patent 6982656 to Coppinger et al., as applied to claim 69 above, and further in view of US publication 2002/0114004 by Ferlitsch.

As to claim 70, see similar rejection to claim 6.

As to claim 72, see similar rejection to claim 8.

12. Claims 73 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., and further in view of US publication 2002/0159419 by Morris, as applied to claim 68 above, and further in view of US publication 2002/0114004 by Ferlitsch.

As to claim 73, see similar rejection to claim 9.

13. Claims 25, 27-31, 58, 60-64, 74, 76 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., and further in view of US publication 2002/0159419 by Morris, as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of US patent 7171478 to Lueckhoff et al.

As to claim 25, see similar rejection to claim 2.

As to claim 27, see similar rejection to claim 4.

As to claim 28, see similar rejection to claim 3.

As to claim 29, see similar rejection to claim 2.

As to claim 30, see similar rejection to claim 15.

As to claim 31, see similar rejection to claim 16.

Claims (58, 60-64) are manufacture claims corresponding to method claims (25, 27-31). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

As to claim 74, see similar rejection to claim 2.

As to claim 76, see similar rejection to claim 4.

14. Claims 32-33, 65-66 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 1187022 by Arteaga et al., in view of US publication 2005/0091302 by Soin et al., and further in view of US publication 2002/0159419 by Morris, as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of US patent 7171478 to Lueckhoff et al.

As to claim 32, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Morris does not expressly disclose the method of claim 24, wherein said client is a proxy client on a server, said server interfaced with at least one additional server. Lueckhoff et al. discloses a proxy client on a server and server interfaced with at least one additional server (figure 3, 5-6; col. 6, lines 4-31).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Morris, with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding a proxy client on a server and server interfaced with additional server. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to use proxy to serve as intermediaries between server and external components (Lueckhoff et al., col. 6, lines 4-7).

As to claim 33, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al. and Morris disclose a method for informing a server about the presence of network resources, said method comprising the steps of: a) emulating a plug-and-play event notification regarding a network resource in communication with the proxy client; b) redirecting said emulated event notification to a server; and c) receiving, from the server, a command directed to said network resource. See similar rejection to claim 24. However, Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Morris does not disclose a proxy client. Lueckhoff et al. discloses a proxy client (figure 3, 5-6; col. 6, lines 4-31).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al. and Morris, with the method disclosed by Lueckhoff et al. regarding a proxy client. See similar motivation in claim 32 rejection.

Claims (65-66) are manufacture claims corresponding to method claims (32-33). Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon method claims respectively.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUA FAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5311. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lunyi Lao can be reached on (571) 272-7671. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 4134

/Lun-Yi Lao/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4134